



RDMS DocID 00100194

Carolyn Casey
03/09/2004 01:27 PM

To: kmclarke@loureiro.com, TCharlton@macdermid.com
cc:
Subject: MacDermid EI

RCRA RECORDS CENTER
FACILITY MacDermid
I.D. NO. CTD00116 4599
FILE LOC. 12-13
OTHER RDMS# 100194

Sorry, I sent this to the wrong Kim this morning.

Could you also define the data qualifiers please. There is at least an "H" that needs to be defined.
Thanks

----- Forwarded by Carolyn Casey/R1/USEPA/US on 03/09/2004 01:23 PM -----

Carolyn Casey
03/09/2004 09:58 AM

To: kburns@sestech-env.com, TCharlton@macdermid.com
cc:
Subject: MacDermid EI

Thanks for the submittal. There are a few holes that we'd like to fill in up front. If you could get me the following additional information as soon as possible so I can complete the review.

Could you please send me all the lab data sheets for the 9/03 GW sampling, and information for the new wells that were installed (MW-116). Also, any other new data collected since the last submittal (April 2003).

The vinyl chloride in MW-116 in excess of the residential volatilization criteria is an issue. Granted it is in the deep well, but I don't have the depth of the shallow well pair, or the results for the shallow well. Also, GW depth in that deep well is 31.69 feet, not much over the 30' cut off for the RSR VC for GW. Since we don't really know the depth to GW at the residential properties across the street, it would be worth while to be conservative and look at this a little closer.

There appears to be a problem with the GW contour at well MW-116. For example, the groundwater elevation in the newly-installed well MW-116S is reported as 963.08 feet on Drawing 2 and the elevation in nearby well MW-112 is reported as 963.18 feet. It is unclear why well MW-116S is depicted closer to the 964 foot contour line than well MW-112, which reported a higher groundwater elevation. A more accurate representation of groundwater flow based on the collected data may indicate a westerly flow component in this area of the site. It also appears that a limited number of wells were used to generate data for the groundwater elevation map, which may have contributed to a groundwater flow interpretation that is not entirely supported. Wells MW-104, MW-106, MW-107, and MW-108 were not used in the development of the contours for various reasons (i.e., wells were destroyed, wells reported product, etc.), as noted on Figure 2. According to Table 1 in Attachment 3, it also appears that groundwater data was not collected from well MW-103, although this is not indicated in the Notes section on Figure 2.

Could you take a second look at the data and this contour map and revise as necessary.

Thanks